

should be put back into the hands of private individuals? How would you like to see our great water system put into the hands of \$72,000-a-year Busby and Weatherwax of street car fame? Wouldn't you howl? You know it!

Jay Gould once said that the post-office business should be a private institution and run by private individuals.

Now about the machinery of production? The inventive genius of the laboring men and women of the nation have increased a hundred times over the productive capacity of the nation, and who gets the benefit of these great inventions? The common people? No! It is the shrewd exploiters who gobble up and utilize the machinery for their own benefit and to the detriment of the workers. How can these things be remedied? Simplest thing in the world: Nationalization. As to methods, study Socialism and find out. Look for my next on "Methods." Of if you want to learn how it can't be done ask Weatherwax and Busby.—C. M. Maxson, 6620 Normal av.

IMMODESTY IN DRESS.—In reply to a writer on "Immodesty in Dress" I would like to state a few ideas I have on the subject. If a girl appears on the street with short skirts to her shoe tops or higher and people turn and stare and make remarks, this is no sign that either she or her dress is immoral or even immodest.

It is merely a sign that the dress is a new style and people have not become accustomed to it.

Do you remember the first time you saw the skirt with a slit in the side? I can remember very well the first one I saw. I can recall the woman's form, the dress, the color of it, the slit and the hose underneath. I can almost recall her face and the hat she wore. I saw many thousands of that style since, and after it had been in vogue a while I ceased to be

startled by the sight and thought nothing at all about the hose which were exposed at every step. I noticed, too, that men were no longer interested in the girls' hose as they got on and off street cars. They had become accustomed to the sight and it had no novelty for them.

That style was as sensible as women's styles dare to be, but some skirts were altogether too tight, but not all of them. If they are not made so tight as to prevent walking and running they are much more sensible than yards and yards of drapery in skirts.

But the styles change so rapidly we cannot get acquainted with one style before another makes its appearance. Years ago styles used to change once a year. Now they change several times in a season.

People stare at short skirts, but if the style of our grandmothers were to appear suddenly, with mutton-leg sleeves and long, full skirts with hoops I am sure every one would stare just as hard and as many remarks would be made, and yet not one line of the form would be revealed in such a style.

Why should the sight of a girl's limb be immodest. Do we not see men's forms revealed every day in their clothing, in their shirt sleeves and open collars, at the golf links and tennis courts and other field sports? Do we not see men's forms in bathing tights? We never think that men are immoral or immodest in their trunks. They are not—they are only free and not hampered by a lot of senseless drapery.

We only think that girls are immodest because we have not been accustomed to the sight. If girls could wear bathing suits, even trunks, for the period of a generation no one would ever cast a second glance at them.

I heard a good woman say once that if she had a daughter who would ride horseback astride she would punish her. We think nothing of this